



**UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION III
1650 Arch Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103-2029**

January 6, 2016

Ms. Denise Decker
U.S. General Services Administration
Office of Planning and Design Quality
7th Street SW, Room 4004
Washington, DC 20407

Re: FBI Headquarters Consolidation Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Maryland and Virginia, November 2015 (CEQ #20150311)

Dear Ms. Decker:

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, Section 309 of the Clean Air Act and the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations implementing NEPA (40 CFR 1500-1508), the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) Headquarters Consolidation. The DEIS has been prepared by the U.S. General Services Administration (GSA) tasked with decisions and actions associated with property of the Federal government.

The purpose of the proposed action is the consolidation of the existing FBI Headquarters (HQ) into one location within the National Capital Region (NCR) and to provide the FBI with an HQ complex that meets the Interagency Security Committee (ISC) Level V security standards. The consolidation of the FBI HQ is needed to support information sharing, collaboration, and the integration of strategic priorities as well as provide an HQ complex that adheres to the ISC Level V facility standards. Following the construction and acceptance of the consolidated FBI HQ, GSA would exchange title for the J. Edgar Hoover (JEH) parcel (existing FBI HQ location) to the chosen exchange partner to offset a portion of the cost of the consolidated FBI HQ complex. The exchange of the JEH parcel would be required to facilitate the consolidation of the FBI HQ at any of the sites. Cooperating Agencies are the FBI, National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC) and the National Park Service (NPS). There are two primary and integrated decisions to be made by GSA in coordination with FBI and NCPC as cooperating agencies: 1) whether or not to consolidate FBI HQ through the exchange of JEH and 2) to consolidate FBI HQ at either the Greenbelt (Maryland), Landover (Maryland), or Springfield (Virginia) site.

The DEIS evaluates the indirect impacts from the exchange of the JEH based on two Reasonably Foreseeable Development Scenarios (RFDS). The RFDSs are GSA's estimate of what could be reasonably developed by a private developer on the parcel in the foreseeable future. RFDS 1 entails retaining and renovating the existing building -- using the existing footprint and building shell (similar to the No-Action Alternative). RFDS 2 entails demolishing the building on the JEH parcel for redevelopment according to local zoning and land use controls. GSA would have no authority over a private developer's decision on the future use of its lease space.

The DEIS also evaluated the three alternative sites for the FBI HQ consolidation; they are: 1) the Greenbelt Alternative -- approximately 61-acres in Prince George's County, Maryland owned by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) and the State of Maryland; 2) the Landover Alternative -- approximately 80 acres located at the site of the former Landover Mall in Prince George's County, Maryland; it is owned by Lerner Enterprises; and 3) the Springfield Alternative -- approximately 58 acres located in Fairfax County, Virginia at the site of the GSA Franconia Warehouse Complex on a portion of a parcel owned by GSA. The FBI HQ will consist of the following components: main building, parking structures, visitor center, truck inspection facility, central utility plant and associated utility infrastructure, shooting range, and a controlled perimeter fencing. The DEIS does not identify the selection of a Preferred Alternative; the Preferred Alternative would be identified in the Final EIS and/or Record of Decision (ROD).

As a result of our review of the DEIS, EPA rated the three relocation sites the same, as explained below. The rating is based primarily on the uncertainty of impacts potentially resulting from the shooting range, questions about the baseline condition used to compare impacts at each site and potential relocation needs for the GSA warehouse facility from the Springfield site. It is unclear in the DEIS if a firing range is a proposed component to the HQ facility and what impacts would be associated with it, if planned; this should be made clear in the Final EIS. Also of concern is the comparative analysis of impacts, as the baseline for the sites does not seem consistent. Though it is understood that development is planned for the Greenbelt site, it is recommended that a No Action Alternative/No Build (without anticipated development) and the No Action Alternative/mixed use development (incorporating anticipated development for all sites equally) be included in the Final EIS. Other concerns are assessment of transportation/parking secondary and cumulative effects for all sites, documenting commitment to reducing or mitigating for greenhouse gas emissions, managing hazardous materials, lack of information on soils as well as environmental justice assessment methodology. EPA provided detailed comments on the three individual alternative sites in addition to comments on the common elements for the alternative locations in the Technical Comments document (enclosed).

EPA rated the DEIS an EC-2 (Environmental Concerns/Insufficient Information), which indicates that we have environmental concerns regarding the proposal and that there is insufficient information in the document to fully assess the environmental impacts of this project. A copy of EPA's ranking system is enclosed for your reference and can be found on the EPA website at the following address: <http://www.epa.gov/compliance/nepa/comments/ratings.html>.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this project. If you have questions regarding these comments, the staff contact for this project is Karen DelGrosso; she can be reached at 215-814-2765 or delgrosso.karen@epa.gov.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Barbara Rudnick", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Barbara Rudnick
NEPA Team Leader
Office of Environmental Programs

Enclosures (2)

Technical Comments

J. Edgar Hoover (JEH) Parcel

One of the two primary decisions to be made by GSA in coordination with the FBI and NCPC as cooperating agencies is whether or not to consolidate the FBI HQ through the exchange of the JEH to offset a portion of the cost of the consolidated FBI HQ complex. It is commendable of GSA to include potential options of the JEH facility and to evaluate indirect impacts. Even though the ultimate decision as to retaining/renovating or demolishing the building would be the responsibility of the exchange partner, EPA is confident that federal and state regulatory requirements would ensure that redevelopment of JEH would not impact or impede on area plans and initiatives. However, the exchange of the JEH building and Exchange Partner is not a familiar concept. In addition, it is unclear in the DEIS as to whether the JEH building is leased or owned by GSA (it is assumed owned) and whether the alternatives sites (two private owned and one GSA owned) would 1) have a more advantageous cost offset and 2) have an effect on the exchange partner especially in the case of the GSA owned alternative, Springfield site. Please explain and discuss the differences (cost offset comparison to each alternative and private versus government owned).

COMMENTS APPLICABLE TO GREENBELT, LANDOVER and SPRINGFIELD

Proposed Action

Page 11, Proposed Action and Alternatives, identifies and discusses components of the proposed action common to all site alternatives. EPA has questions regarding the components discussed. Questions include parking requirements, evaluation of a shooting range, the requirements of the Level V security and consideration of co-location of the HQ facility with the FBI Central Records Complex.

The first question references parking spaces as it is stated that "Between approximately 3,600 to 7,300 parking spaces would be provided, based on the parking ratios outlined in the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan for the NCR." However, page 3 states, "In December 2011, the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works (EPW) adopted a resolution authorizing GSA to acquire a consolidated FBI HQ. The resolution required the following: The project must include no more than 4,300 parking spaces." Please explain and/or justify why the allowed parking spaces can be as much as 7,300 spaces if the resolution agreed to no more than 4,300 parking spaces. EPA supports active incentives to staff for mass transit use and carpooling; this should be included in all alternatives. Minimizing parking lot size, using structure to reduce footprint and incorporation of best practices for stormwater are encouraged.

The second question pertains to the firing range. The text on pages 11 and 12 does not discuss the firing range as a component area. However, Table 2-1, Facility Component Areas, lists the firing range under the "Visitor Center" Facility Component. Figure 2-1, FBI HQ Facility Components, does not depict the firing range. Please discuss whether the firing range is

a component of the proposed action and where it may be located in reference to the proposed facility component areas. Since Table 2-1 groups the Firing Range with the Visitor Center and Education Center; it seems an unrelated combination of components that can pose a risk to visitors/school-aged children/young adults. If the Firing Range is a component of the proposed action, there should be a description of the facility (as provided for the other components in Figure 2.2, FBI Program). The description should include the use of the facility, kind of range (open vs. indoor), average daily usage, the kind of ammunition to be used, number of rounds used per day/year, the potential hazards from use of ammunition, recovery of shells, impacts to environmental resources, including noise, vibration, waste disposal, etc.

Page 13 states that one of the minimum requirements for the proposed action includes: "Large enough to construct up to 2.1 million rentable square feet (RSF) of office and related space, plus parking as required by local code, able to accommodate the physical requirements of an ISC Level V facility, applicable zoning, and other restrictions imposed by law or regulations." What is required for a Level V facility? Do the requirements include setback restrictions, fencing, bollards, etc.? Please explain what type of adjoining facilities would be considered compatible with Level V security. Information in the study seems to indicate that higher density development is not preferred. In addition, since the sites are located in proximity to major arteries, is there a security risk? What additional security measures may be needed to compensate for easy access and/or view to sites? Please include more information on the ISC Level V requirements for the overall project.

A Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS) for the FBI Central Records Complex (CRC) was published in summer 2015 proposing location of the CRC in Virginia. The question arises as to why this facility would not have been included in the FBI HQ consolidation. Combining the CRC function with the HQ may allow for efficiency and reduced environmental impact. Please discuss if there was any effort to merge the CRC with the FBI HQ Consolidation projects since both are seeking locations within the NCR. If there was consideration of combining the CRC with the FBI HQ, but dropped, please explain why.

The No Action Alternatives

The No Action Alternative is typically referred to as the No Build Alternative (the existing condition of the site with no alternative proposed use). However, the No Action Alternative for the Greenbelt site is the "No-action mixed-use development" Alternative (other development plans independent to the FBI consolidation project located on the Greenbelt site but in another area. If this site is not selected as the alternative site for the FBI HQ, the mixed-use development may proceed). Although this analysis is appreciated, the DEIS should also use the No Action/No Build Alternative as this will provide a baseline from which comparison of the alternatives is critical in the assessment process. As for the Landover site, the No Action Alternative appears to be the No Build Alternative although the site is zoned as Mixed-Use, Transportation Oriented (M-X-T). This classification would provide for a variety of residential, commercial, and employment uses and would guide the development process. Even though no other plans are on the horizon for Landover, it may have been helpful to include the "No-action mixed-use development" Alternative (as provided for the Greenbelt Alternative). The Springfield site used the No Action/No Build Alternative since the site would presumably

continue operation as a GSA warehouse complex if not selected as the Preferred Alternative. This is appropriate for this site if there is no action planned and it will remain as a warehouse complex for GSA. The Final EIS should confirm and clarify any planned alternative future use for the Springfield site. There should be consistency among alternatives for proper analysis. Thus, the alternatives sites should be compared with the No Action/No Build Alternative which provides a baseline of resources, etc. as well as the No Action with potential development, if applicable.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

EPA commends GSA on its discussion of Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions, addressing the 2014 Draft Guidance for Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change Impacts issued by CEQ, as well as Executive Order (EO) 13693, *Planning for Federal Sustainability in the Next Decade*. However, EPA has additional comments for your consideration noted below and within the comments for each of the site alternatives.

Page ES-34 states, "There are no mitigation measures recommended for land use, planning studies, and zoning, visual resources, socioeconomics, public health and safety, parking, truck access, and greenhouse gas emissions." EPA encourages the lead Federal agency to describe measures to reduce GHG emissions associated with their project. EO 13693 outlines a combination of more efficient Federal operations to reduce agency direct greenhouse gas emissions while fostering innovation, reducing spending and strengthening the communities in which Federal facilities operate. It appears that mitigation measures are mentioned in the DEIS/Appendix F, Air Quality Evaluation Technical Documentation. Therefore, it is recommended that the FEIS and Record of Decision (ROD) outline and commit to implementation of reasonable mitigation measures that would reduce or eliminate project-related GHG emissions.

Section 8.5, Climate Change and Sustainability, page 616, states, "For this project to be climate resistant over time, climate protection levels (CPL) must be developed by the exchange partner and incorporated into project design, construction, operations and maintenance." Because GSA is the lead Federal agency, it is assumed that there will be oversight in project development to ensure that the exchange partner is considering climate change and sustainability into project design, construction, operations and maintenance. Collaborative efforts foster more fruitful outcomes in meeting target goals for reductions in GHG emissions. Please discuss GSA's long-term involvement (as well as the cooperating agencies) in regards to climate change and sustainability.

Hazardous Material

Page 304 states, "During operation of the facility, materials handling and storage protocols for the delivery and on-site use of hazardous materials (for example, ammunition for the shooting range) would be implemented." As stated in an earlier comment, please identify where the shooting range will be located on each of the three alternative sites (Greenbelt, Landover, and Springfield), whether the range is indoor or outdoor, quantify the rounds used per

day, discuss whether rounds contain lead and how used rounds will be retrieved, if rounds can impact groundwater if left in berms, storage and handling of ammunition, etc.

Earth Resources/Soils

Page 36 states, "While GSA has conducted preliminary geotechnical investigations at the Greenbelt, Landover, and Springfield sites in support of the exchange partner and procurement process, this data was not available in time for inclusion in the DEIS." The DEIS did not state whether the results of the investigation will be included in the FEIS, if available. Please address and include results in the FEIS. Soil suitability for construction, infiltration (for stormwater), or potential need for remediation, etc should be included in the NEPA analysis.

Secondary Impacts Related to Highway Infrastructure

It is not clear in the DEIS as to the environmental impacts that would occur as a result of highway infrastructure and transportation improvements that would be necessary due to the FBI HQ consolidation at any of the alternative sites. The DEIS should provide a summary of impacts that would result from the highway infrastructure transportation improvement projects along with the resource impacts for each of the alternative site locations. The cumulative impacts to resources as a result of the primary action (site location) and the secondary action (transportation improvements) and other activities in the area should be provided to fully understand the cumulative impact to resources. It would benefit the reader to include a summary of the impacts of primary and secondary actions in order to assess and make a fair comparison of all alternatives.

Environmental Justice

The calculations are not shown for determining the benchmark values used in the Environmental Justice (EJ) assessment. All calculations need to be made available so that the appropriateness of the values used as benchmarks may be determined and compared to the minority population percentages for each of the census tracts (or block groups) in the study area.

Figures that show the census tracts (or block groups) within one mile of the alternative locations do not have the percent minority population values shown for evaluative purposes.

Please note that according to EO 12898, an area that has a population of more than 50% is by their definition "minority." Refer to EO 12898, Section 1-1 IMPLEMENTATION, Section 1-101 Agency Responsibilities, which states in part: "Minority population: Minority populations should be identified where either: (a) the minority population of the affected area exceeds 50% or (b) the minority population percentage of the affected area is meaningfully greater than the minority population percentage in the general population or other appropriate unit of geographic analysis. In identifying minority communities, agencies may consider as a community either a group of individuals living in geographic proximity to one another, or a geographically dispersed/transient set of individuals (such as migrant worker or native American), where either type of group experiences common conditions of environmental exposure or effect. The selection of the appropriate unit of geographic analysis...."

A description of how to calculate the benchmark values is presented below. This may be helpful in calculating the benchmarks. Neither the values nor data used to identify areas of potential EJ concern could be found in the document.

Calculating Benchmark Values for EJ Analysis

1. Determining Appropriate Benchmarks

- a. Determine your approach to establishing your benchmark
 - Apply the 50% test (all areas that are more than 50% are areas of EJ concern.)
- b. Determine your benchmark value by comparison to the state or county average
 - If the % minority population is > the state or county average, then this would = Area of Potential EJ concern; OR
 - Set a benchmark that exceeds the state or county average by a given percentage (e.g., taking 110% of the state or county average).

2. Calculate the Benchmark Value

- State A has a minority population % of 5%.
 - The calculation is $5 \text{ (minority population percentage)} \times 1.1 \text{ (110\%)} = 5.5\%$ (the benchmark value)
- State B has a minority population % of 25%.
 - The calculation is $25 \text{ (minority population percentage)} \times 1.1 \text{ (110\%)} = 27.5\%$ (the benchmark value)
- This method works equally well for all values and percentages.
 - For an additional 10% of the minority population average use 1.1 (110%)
 - For an additional 20% of the minority population average use 1.2 (120%)

Example:

- If a utility company wants to raise rates, and it adds \$10 dollars to each person's rates: A person paying \$10 dollars would now pay \$20 dollars, double the former rate (a 100% increase). A person paying \$100 dollars would now pay \$110 dollars (a 10% increase).
- **Using the percent method**, a person paying \$10 dollars would pay $(10 \times 1.1 = 11)$ or \$11 dollars (10% more than before). A person paying \$25 dollars would pay $(25 \times 1.1 = 27.5)$ or \$27.5 dollars (10 % more than before).

GREENBELT ALTERNATIVE

Surface Water – Page 283 states, “Over the long term, there could be adverse impacts to Indian Creek resulting from any engineering measures that would be implemented along the secure perimeter, adjacent to Indian Creek, to control erosion and minimize the channel shifting, a characteristic of braided stream channels. Stream mitigation, if necessary, would be compliant with the requirements of Section 404 of the CWA.” Please be more specific as to the impact to Indian Creek. What engineering measures will be implemented? How much of the stream will be impacted? Figure 5-1, Greenbelt Conceptual Site Plan, depicts a narrow buffer between HQ Building Developable Area and Indian Creek. What is the width of the buffer between HQ building and Indian Creek? Page 225 states, “Channelization and the lack of riparian buffers are listed as major stressors to watershed health throughout the tidal freshwater portion of the

Anacostia River basin.” Proper stream buffers are critical to the health of the watershed and site design should ensure efficient riparian buffers are incorporated into design plan. Please address.

Groundwater -- Page 225 states ‘...groundwater is anticipated to be encountered at less than 1 foot below ground surface in and around Indian Creek and at approximately 10 feet below ground surface in the developed western half of the site (GSA 2014b).’ How will the proposed action at the Greenbelt site be impacted by shallow groundwater? Will shallow groundwater limit underground construction? Also, how will the site impact groundwater especially when combined with impacts from roadway widening? It is unclear how groundwater and water quality will improve (as noted on page 285 - due to the increase in pervious surface planned and compliance with EISA requirements) with a shallow water table which will limit ground water infiltration and the uncertainty of soil characteristics (lack of infiltration testing). It is important to note that any construction alters the hydrology of a site and these changes are not without impact; hydrologic changes are particularly likely with the increase in pervious surface, potential decrease in natural buffer, areas/time for infiltration, etc.

In addition, the DEIS references that impacts to groundwater would be the same for the No Action Alternative (mixed-use development) and the Greenbelt Alternative and both would be subject to the same permitting and regulatory requirements. Even with adherence to permitting and regulatory requirements and unless building design can be altered to prevent impacts to groundwater, EPA strongly recommends comparison of resource impacts of the No Action/No Build alternative as well as the other action alternatives (Landover and Springfield) to determine the impacts on each site as well as determine the environmentally preferable alternative. We suggest this will be a more accurate benchmark for assessing resource impacts. Comparing the Greenbelt Alternative with the No Action Alternative (mixed-use development) Alternatives underestimates environmental impacts associated with the proposed action. Please include and assess the No Action/No Build Alternative.

Floodplain -- Page 228 states, “If the Greenbelt site were selected as the preferred alternative, the exchange partner would be responsible for ensuring compliance with this permitting requirement.” Reference is being made to the FEMA floodplain. Since the site will be leased through GSA, it would seem then that GSA would have some level of involvement/oversight to ensure that the exchange partner is complying with permitting requirements as well. Please confirm/discuss. Federal agencies have been tasked to ensure recognition and maintenance of floodplain functions per Executive Order 11988.

Biological Resources -- Page 230 states, “The area surrounding the Greenbelt site has been identified as a Green Infrastructure Corridor by Maryland’s Environmental Resources and Land Information Network, connecting extensive natural areas immediately upstream and downstream of the site (State of Maryland 2015).” Please describe the “Green Infrastructure Network” and its resources as well as discuss the potential impacts that the Greenbelt Alternative may have on this network and possible mitigation. Use quantifiable values to describe the resources both on-site and off-site, as part of the green corridor. Any proposed design features to maintain or enhance connectivity or potential mitigation for wildlife passage or green infrastructure replacement should be explained in the EIS.

Aquatic Resources -- Page 230 states, "Because Indian Creek provides suitable aquatic habitat, it is likely that fish species are present in Indian Creek at the Greenbelt site." It appears as if the last stream survey was conducted in 2006. If Greenbelt is selected as the Preferred Alternative and since the last survey was conducted nine years ago, will Indian Creek be surveyed for aquatic resources to determine baseline data? Also, if Greenbelt is the selected site for the FBI HQ, will there be on-going monitoring of the creek to ensure that the water quality of the creek does not degrade over time and that aquatic resources are not impacted by the proposed development?

Page 234 states, "During public scoping, several individuals and community naturalist and conservation groups advocated that public access remain available for these uses, due to the diversity of the wetland habitat and the variety of wildlife seen on the site. In fall of 2014, Maryland's Board of Public Works (BPW), composed of the Governor, Comptroller and Treasurer, approved the granting of an approximately 22-acre security easement to the Federal Government on this state-owned land that would preserve this land in its current state. BPW would consider extending approval for another year (Sanford 2015)." What is the size of the southeast portion of the site, owned by the State of Maryland that consists of almost entirely woodlands and wetlands, and contains segments of the Indian Creek and associated unnamed tributaries, which ultimately feeds into the Anacostia River? It is not clear if the natural area is the entire 22-acres set aside for the security easement or if the natural area is larger so that an additional area can be used to accommodate for public access. Will there be access to the public? If so, how will public access impact security at the FBI HQ?

Hazardous Materials -- Page 253 states, "Despite the absence of any Recognized Environmental Conditions at the site, the site assessment concluded that fill material of unknown environmental quality may have been placed at the site for development of the surface parking lot." EPA is aware (as noted in Soils comment above) that GSA conducted preliminary geotechnical investigations, but did not have data in time for inclusion in the DEIS. Will these investigations identify fill material? If not, will there be soil sampling on the site (especially the surface parking lot area) to determine the environmental integrity of the soil if the Greenbelt site is selected as the preferred alternative?

Greenhouse Gas Emissions/Climate Change -- Page 278 states, "There are mobile source emissions associated with the portion of Greenbelt Metro Station vehicular traffic using the existing surface parking lot within the site boundary. However, due to incomplete data, including the daily number of vehicles parking within the site boundaries, and the origins of those trips, these emissions cannot be quantified without further study." This information is important to determining baseline data for use in comparing to the Greenbelt Alternative and the No-Action mixed-use development Alternative.

Most reasonable scenarios can be used to estimate vehicle use/parking and emissions. The text in the Affected Environment section should discuss climate change and ongoing and reasonably foreseeable climate change impacts relevant to each site, based on U.S. Global Change Research Program (<http://www.globalchange.gov/>) assessments, to assist with identification of potential project impacts that may be exacerbated by climate change and to inform consideration of measures to adapt to climate change impacts (among other things, this

will assist in identifying resilience-related changes to the proposal that should be considered). Since the Landover Alternative would be the same as described for Greenbelt, this same comment applies to the Landover Alternative.

Page 342 states, "Total GHG emissions would be approximately 33 percent higher than the emissions of the Greenbelt No-action mixed-use development. This difference in emissions is attributable to the relatively high natural gas consumption per square foot of the FBI Criminal Justice Information Services Division (CJIS) (the basis for the Greenbelt Alternative natural gas consumption estimate) compared to the commercial, office, residential and hotel-specific consumption data reported to the District Department of Energy and Environment (the basis for the Greenbelt No-action natural gas consumption estimate)." The GHG emissions should also be compared to the No Action/No Build Alternative. Please explain why the CJIS would result in high natural gas consumption per year, what is its function and how can it be distinguished from other FBI components that would be transferred to the FBI HQ site if the Greenbelt Alternative is selected.

Page 342 states, "These factors combined result in an estimated 51 percent increase in mobile source GHG emissions from FBI employees/contractor commuting related to the JEH No-action Alternative. Overall, there would be direct, long-term, adverse impacts to GHG emissions." How many employees would be commuting to the Greenbelt site relative to the JEH location? What is the difference in in-take of employees from the JEH site and other FBI sites deemed for consolidation? EPA appreciates the comparison with the No-action mixed-use development Alternative, but also seeks comparison with the No Action/No Build Alternative (and assesses comparison among all alternative sites).

Water resources -- Page 283 states, "Over the long term, there could be adverse impacts to Indian Creek resulting from any engineering measures that would be implemented along the secure perimeter, adjacent to Indian Creek, to control erosion and minimize the channel shifting, a characteristic of braided stream channels. Stream mitigation, if necessary, would be compliant with the requirements of Section 404 of the CWA." What may be involved in "re-engineering Indian Creek? What impacts are anticipated? Adhering to the requirements of Section 404 of the CWA, avoidance is preferable. Is there any changes in site/building design that can be made to avoid impacts to Indian Creek? If impacts are inevitable, then how will this directly impact aquatic biota and water quality both in the short-term and long-term? EPA appreciates as noted on page 289 "Correspondence received from MDDNR during agency scoping for this project indicates that aquatic species would be protected by the spring/summer instream work restriction period, stringent sediment and erosion control methods, and other BMPs typically used for protection of stream resources." However, a description of the potential re-engineering of the stream would be helpful to understand the kind of work and degree of change proposed for Indian Creek (quantify where possible the length, depth and size of the impact to the creek).

In addition, the cumulative impact that would result to Indian Creek and Beaverdam Creek due to transportation construction is not clear. Page 289 indicates that the construction of roadways and widening along Edmonston Road and Powder Mill Road would have the potential to adversely impact aquatic habitats associated with these two Creeks. Please assess the cumulative impacts to water quality and aquatic resources from both the construction/operation

on the Greenbelt site and transportation improvements. EPA notes the statement made on page 595, "Long-term, adverse impacts to surface water and stormwater hydrology and floodplains from permanent disturbances would be mitigated and minimized through permits, mitigation measures, BMPs, and management plans as discussed in Chapter 4." However, it is beneficial to have an in-depth discussion of impacts from both the site and roadway improvements for each alternative site as this provides valuable information in assessing impacts for each alternative site.

Wetlands – It is EPA's understanding that the Greenbelt site includes a wetlands mitigation site; however, this is not mentioned in the DEIS. Please confirm and include in the FEIS information about the mitigation site, including quantitative data and map(s) depicting the mitigation site in relation to the proposed construction of facilities for the FBI HQ and success or failure at the site. Also, discuss how the proposed development would impede on the mitigation site. Would the success of the mitigation site be thwarted by the proposed development of the FBI HQ consolidation?

Please confirm the total acreage of wetlands on the Greenbelt site and study area. Table 5-2 on page 226 shows the NWI wetland delineation to be 32.8 acres of wetlands, the MDDNR delineated 15.0 acres and ALTA Survey delineated 5.4 acres of wetlands. A sum of these totals is 53.2 acres of wetlands on the Greenbelt site. It is not clear if there is overlap from each of the sources or why there is a variation among sources of wetland information. Please explain.

EPA understands that more precise wetland delineations would be required to quantify the amount of wetlands impacted from the Greenbelt Alternative. Of course, it is preferable to avoid or minimize impacts to wetlands whenever possible. Page 286 states, "Under the Greenbelt Alternative, construction of consolidated FBI HQ campus would directly impact wetlands in the same manner as they would under the No-action Alternative." In addition to the total size of wetlands on and surrounding the Greenbelt site, please specify and quantify the direct impact to wetlands. The size and functional values of all impacted wetland should be provided and a mitigation plan proposed. It is uncertain that alternative build scenarios would not avoid aquatic resource impacts. As stated previously, the No Action/No Build is a useful baseline to compare potential impacts.

Page 286 states, "All delineated wetlands on the Greenbelt site, including the 25-foot nontidal wetland buffer required by MDE, are outside of the secure perimeter, as shown in figure 5-31. However, future delineations performed during the growing season may indicate an increase in the wetlands along the current easterly extent of planned site disturbance. If future wetland surveys identify additional wetlands, the permitting requirements and mitigation strategies described in section 3.3.4 would apply." EPA appreciates what is stated on page 41, Section 3.3.4.3, "In Maryland, mitigation and monitoring would be required for any authorized impacts to wetlands and/or the associated 25-foot wetland buffer." Although delineated wetlands on the Greenbelt site, including the 25-foot nontidal wetland buffer are outside of the secure perimeter, they are still within the site boundary. As a result, impacts to wetlands are likely to occur, both direct and indirect. Impacts to wetlands outside of the secure perimeter should be described and quantified.

Also, page 286 states, "There is high potential for direct, long-term, adverse impacts to wetlands as a result of transportation mitigation and road widening along Edmonston Road, north of Cherrywood Lane. NWI and MDE data show large expanses of palustrine forested wetlands associated with Indian Creek and Beaverdam Creek adjacent to the proposed roadway improvements, as shown in figure 5-32." If the transportation projects are a direct result of the Greenbelt site, then impacts to wetlands both direct and indirect on-site and off-site due to transportation improvements that would result because of the proposed action should be quantified in text and tables. A cumulative analyses of wetland impacts from both the Greenbelt construction and the transportation improvement projects should be discussed and provided in the FEIS.

It appears that the Greenbelt site would not be identified as the environmentally preferable alternative. It is recommended that the Final EIS discuss sites in terms of the environmental preferable alternative when information is available to assess.

Vegetation -- Page 289 states that approximately 2 acres of existing vegetation (consisting of grasses, shrubs, and saplings) would be removed on the Greenbelt site. However, vegetation (including trees, shrubs, and grasses) would be reintroduced to portions of the previously disturbed and currently impervious portion of the site. Please quantify the vegetation proposed to be reintroduced, will it equate to that which will be removed -- will it be more or less?

Also, please quantify the vegetation impacts associated with construction along the approximately 4,300 linear feet of roadways requiring substantial widening, including along Edmonston Road and Powder Mill Road. Will loss of vegetation due to roadway improvements be mitigated? What is the cumulative impact to vegetation?

Natural Gas -- Page 347 states that since the nearest main operating at transmission pressure is approximately 2 miles from the Greenbelt site, extension of transmission pressure service to the site would require crossing I-495, a major highway. What are the environmental impacts of extending the transmission line? Where will the transmission line be located? What is the depth and width needed for the line? Please describe the environment disturbed and impacts associated with installing the transmission line.

Electric Power -- Page 347 states, "...most of the work would likely occur within existing ROW and/or easements. Even so, direct, short-term, adverse impacts are anticipated due to the additional several mile length of the service extensions required to provide the desired level of redundancy and to meet the FBI HQ campus's demand." What is the environmental impact to installation of transmission lines? Please address for both Greenbelt and Landover alternatives.

LANDOVER ALTERNATIVE

Land Use -- The Landover site is 80 acres, and it is assumed that the FBI HQ does not require the total space (as alternative sites range from 58-61 acres). In fact, page 406 states, "Consolidating the FBI HQ at the Landover site would not promote higher density compact

mixed-use developments as outlined in the goals for Plan Prince George's 2035; instead the site would contain an ample amount of unused space and, in order to comply with the requirements of an Interagency Security Committee (ISC) Level V facility, would not be designed in a compact manner." The text continues, "Furthermore, the site would be designated for single use." It is unclear if requirements of Level V excludes compact design, how other sites comply. With the extra space that Landover offers, will site plans allow for open, green space? Incorporation of natural features, reduction of impervious surface, added Low Impact Development in design may bring benefit to the area. Are there anticipated uses for the "extra" property (from the Master Plan or other potential plans) that are compatible with the FBI HQ? Is it possible to provide employees a shuttle service or other connection from transit to the site?

Hazardous Materials/Groundwater -- Page 375 states, "Two 25,000-gallon underground storage tanks and an 8,000-gallon underground storage tank were abandoned in place at the site in October 1988. The case was closed in 1991. The Maryland Historical Underground Storage Tank database contains an inventory of reported historic leaking underground storage tank incidents prior to 1999. The site was identified in the database as Sears Auto Center, located at 2101 Brightseat Road. According to the database, a 1,000-gallon used oil tank was removed and no active remediation is present, only sampling of monitoring wells." Where are the two underground storage tanks that were left in place in relation to proposed action facilities? Will they be removed prior to construction of proposed action? Depict where the monitoring wells are located on the site and show proximity to the proposed facilities? Specify substance(s) that the wells are monitoring for and provide results of the monitoring wells?

Transportation Mitigations (Soils/Vegetation) – Page 400 states "With the exception of the new connector road, the potential impacts to geology in these areas would be minimal because they would occur within previously disturbed areas adjacent to existing roadways." Please discuss, quantify and describe the impacts and resources associated with the new connector road.

The text continues, "There would be approximately 400 linear feet of new roadway construction associated with the site south access connector road that would pass through relatively undisturbed land. Given the small area of new disturbance, there would be no impacts to significant geologic features." Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor, but collectively significant actions. Therefore, the undisturbed land/area of disturbance should be described to include total size of impact (width/length) and description of resources impacted by road improvement.

Protection of Children -- Page 414 states, "Excell Academy Public Charter School and Kenmoor Middle School are located on major roads that could be used for construction traffic and may see an increase in commuter traffic as a result of this project." The text goes on to say, "...some impacts to children, such as releases of odor and dust during the construction of the Landover site, may occur as a result of children living in the neighborhoods in proximity to the proposed location for this alternative. Additionally, an increase in traffic to and from the project site would impact children that are commuting or walking to school. However, these impacts would not have a disproportionately high and adverse impact to children. Therefore, no measurable impacts to children are expected to occur as a result of this alternative."

It is unclear how GSA made this determination, as no data for children living in proximity to the project site was provided in the DEIS. Even without statistics of children living in the area, the presence of schools located on major roads used for construction traffic could be reason to assess impacts to children. What, if any, vehicle accident reports are known for the roads where schools are located and construction traffic will increase? What can be implemented to ensure that children are safe while commuting/walking to and from schools? Has GSA considered exposure and impacts to children from mobile source air pollutants from project construction and operations, including significant increases in traffic predicted as a result of the project? Children are believed to be especially vulnerable due to higher relative doses of air pollution, smaller diameter airways, and more active time spent outdoors and closer to ground-level sources of vehicle exhaust. Many children are compromised with asthma and related illnesses that may be detrimentally affected by an increase in pollution and traffic. Diesel emissions have been linked to asthma. Has GSA considered the impacts from diesel emissions on children's health? It is important to consider construction/operation impacts to children identified in close proximity to project emission sources, road traffic, street crossing, truck exhaust, etc. Additional statistical data of children living and going to school/day care in the area of the project site would be useful particularly if the alternative is moved forward for more detailed consideration.

Parking – Page 434 states, "...in accordance with NCPC parking policy, a parking ratio of one parking space for every 1.5 employees would be maintained, equating to approximately 7,370 spots." These spaces would be accommodated in two 10-story parking structures and up to 323 visitor parking spaces would be provided near the Visitor Center. The need for parking spaces is much greater at the Landover site than the other sites (Greenbelt 3600 employee parking spaces/135 visitor parking spaces; Springfield 3600 employee parking spaces/145 visitor parking spaces). As stated on page 461, "The lack of transit accessibility at the Landover site results in a large increase in the number of employees driving along, from 13.5 percent for the JEH parcel to 63.3 percent for the Landover site. These factors combined result in an estimated 170 percent increase in mobile source GHG emissions relative to the No-action Alternative." This is a considerable difference when compared with the other two alternative sites adding significantly to the GHG emissions. From the viewpoint of GHG/Climate Change and air toxics, this alternative does not appear to be the most environmentally advantageous. It is assumed that the proposed transportation mitigation will not alleviate or decrease the impact from commuting in addition to air toxics, GHG emissions, etc. Please discuss.

GHG Emissions and Air Quality – refer to GHG comment for Greenbelt site above which applies to the Landover site.

Electric Power -- Page 465 states, "Although most of the work would likely occur within existing rights-of-way and/or easements, there would be direct, short-term, adverse impacts associated with the construction of several miles of transmission lines necessary to feed 69kV power to the site. However, no measurable long-term impacts would occur at the Landover site." How much of the area will be within the existing rights-of-way and/or easements versus disturbance outside of the rights-of-way/easements? Even if no long term impacts will not occur

at the Landover site, impacts to resources as a result of the action for the FBI HQ consolidation are still considered as secondary impacts as must be discussed.

Miscellaneous -- Page 462 states, "As a result, there would be direct, long-term adverse impacts to air quality from stationary sources as a result of the Greenbelt Alternative." It is assumed that since the discussion is on the Landover site that the referenced alternative should be Landover not Greenbelt. Confirm/Change.

SPRINGFIELD ALTERNATIVE

The Springfield site seems to be an advantageous site selection for GSA because of Federal ownership of the site making it the most cost effective. In addition, the Springfield site fulfills many of the objectives of the Federal Elements of the Comprehensive Plan for the NCR (i.e., utilizes available federally owned land, located in proximity to multi-modal transportation options, enhances operational efficiencies, etc. In addition, this site may be the environmentally preferable alternative in comparison with the other two alternative sites (at least in this stage of the analysis and without further information requested in the Technical Comments; the site offers fewer natural resource impacts and availability of mass transit).

The DEIS is unclear if the Springfield site is used, if GSA will need to acquire a new parcel to relocate the existing GSA facility, or if the site is underutilized and can operate co-located or that the GSA facility is unnecessary. It is important that the Final EIS is clear. If another site would be needed, this should be explained and associated land requirements and impacts estimated. Page 471 states that the Springfield site is federally owned land. "The General Services Administration (GSA) currently operates a warehouse complex at this site, which is divided into two sections: (1) Building A and sprinkler house, and; (2) Buildings B, C, D, and 1 through 12, referred to as the Logistics Operation Center (LOC), as shown in figure 7-2. GSA provides government agencies space in Building A for storing, shipping, and receiving dry goods, primarily office supplies, furniture, and electronics. There is a small vehicle fueling center used by the LOC adjacent to Building B." If the Springfield site is selected as the preferred alternative site, will the GSA warehouse complex be relocated to another location? Please describe and discuss the secondary action that may result if the Springfield site is selected as the Preferred Alternative.

Exchange Partner -- Page 35 of 3.0 Impact Evaluation Methodology, states that the exchange of the JEH parcel is a component of the Greenbelt, Landover, and Springfield Alternatives. Page 81 of the 4.0 JEH parcel states, "GSA intends to exchange the JEH parcel to partially fund the consolidation of the FBI HQ at a new site. Because the exchange is considered part of the Proposed Action, GSA must assess the indirect effects of its action to exchange the JEH parcel even though the exchange would occur later in time (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 1508.8)." EPA understands the monetary motive of exchanging the JEH parcel to fund the consolidation of the FBI HQ at a new site, especially if the site is not federally owned. If the Springfield site is selected as the Preferred Alternative, would this eliminate the need for GSA to decide to consolidate FBI HQ through the exchange of the JEH? Or, will the developer/builder be given responsibility for the outcome of the JEH building to offset the cost of construction of the new FBI HQ? Clarification would be useful in the FEIS.

Land Use – Page 480, Figure 7-10 and page 481, Figure 7-11 references “natural systems,” “place making opportunity sites – central green,” “place making opportunity sites – urban plaza,” “place making opportunity sites – pocket park,” “focal point of place making” – please describe these categories and distinguish among each of them.

Transportation/Security – Page 482 states “Springfield has extensive access to the regional highway network with its proximity to I-395, I-95, and I-95/I-495 (Fairfax County 2013b).” Although there is a traveling benefit to close proximity of major arteries, is this a security concern for the FBI? What additional security measures will be needed since the surrounding area is in view of major arteries (i.e. I-95)? Have potential threats to this specific site been assessed to consider potential vulnerability/security breaches?

Vegetation – Page 530 states, “Due to the presence of some natural habitat around the borders of the site, there is a degree of likelihood that a federally listed migratory bird of conservation concern may be present at the Springfield site year-round or for breeding or wintering purposes.” Please describe vegetation and quantify. It is assumed that the “natural habitat” referred to is the “small groupings of trees at the perimeter” of the site (as noted on page 476). Please confirm.

Protection of Children -- Page 538 states, “Forestdale Elementary School is located approximately 0.5 mile north of the site along Franconia Road East.” In addition, “A neighborhood located southwest of the site and an apartment community located northwest of the site could be impacted by construction noise and air quality issues.” “Some impacts to children, such as releases of odor and dust during the construction of the Springfield site, may occur if children live in the neighborhoods in close proximity to the site.” The text goes on, “However, because the neighborhoods most likely to be impacted by this alternative are not made up predominantly of children, these impacts would not have a disproportionately high and adverse impact to children.” It is unclear how GSA made this determination; no data for children living in proximity to the project site was provided in the DEIS. Children commuting to school should be considered whether they live in the area or not. Please provide information on the number of children living and going to school/day care in the FEIS and assess impacts from the proposed action, include impacts from truck exhaust. The Landover comment above on the Protection of Children applies here for the Springfield site. Please reference and address. Measures to reduce or mitigate any impacts to children and the communities should be evaluated.

MISCELLANEOUS

Page 14, Primary Design Requirements, states “VC, visitor parking, vehicular screen, and TIF would be located outside of the controlled perimeter.” In addition, “Truck access points would be located with the TIF.” TIF stands for Truck Inspection Facility, but it is not listed in the List of Acronyms. GSA may want to add it to the list.

Page 301 which starts with “There would be no measurable short-term impacts...” is missing from the on-line copy of the DEIS.

Page 537 states, "Therefore, a majority of the census tracts around the Springfield site contain sensitive communities (see Figure 7-4)." Figure 7-4 represents the Physiographic Provinces of the National Capital Region. The correct figure referenced on page 537 should be Figure 7-16, Springfield Alternative Sensitive Populations.

Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Rating System Criteria

RATING THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT OF THE ACTION

LO (Lack of Objections) - The review has not identified any potential environmental impacts requiring substantive changes to the preferred alternative. The review may have disclosed opportunities for application of mitigation measures that could be accomplished with no more than minor changes to the proposed action.

EC (Environmental Concerns) - The review has identified environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment. Corrective measures may require changes to the preferred alternative or application of mitigation measures that can reduce the environmental impact.

EO (Environmental Objections) - The review has identified significant environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to adequately protect the environment. Corrective measures may require substantial changes to the preferred alternative or consideration of some other project alternative (including the no action alternative or a new alternative). The basis for environmental Objections can include situations:

1. Where an action might violate or be inconsistent with achievement or maintenance of a national environmental standard;
2. Where the Federal agency violates its own substantive environmental requirements that relate to EPA's areas of jurisdiction or expertise;
3. Where there is a violation of an EPA policy declaration;
4. Where there are no applicable standards or where applicable standards will not be violated but there is potential for significant environmental degradation that could be corrected by project modification or other feasible alternatives; or
5. Where proceeding with the proposed action would set a precedent for future actions that collectively could result in significant environmental impacts.

EU (Environmentally Unsatisfactory) - The review has identified adverse environmental impacts that are of sufficient magnitude that EPA believes the proposed action must not proceed as proposed. The basis for an environmentally unsatisfactory determination consists of identification of environmentally objectionable impacts as defined above and one or more of the following conditions:

1. The potential violation of or inconsistency with a national environmental standard is substantive and/or will occur on a long-term basis;
2. There are no applicable standards but the severity, duration, or geographical scope of the impacts associated with the proposed action warrant special attention; or
3. The potential environmental impacts resulting from the proposed action are of national importance because of the threat to national environmental resources or to environmental policies.

RATING THE ADEQUACY OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (EIS)

1 (Adequate) - The draft EIS adequately sets forth the environmental impacts(s) of the preferred alternative and those of the alternatives reasonably available to the project or action. No further analysis or data collection is necessary, but the reviewer may suggest the addition of clarifying language or information.

2 (Insufficient Information) - The draft EIS does not contain sufficient information to fully assess environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment, or the reviewer has identified new reasonably available alternatives that are within the spectrum of alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS, which could reduce the environmental impacts of the proposal. The identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussion should be included in the final EIS.

3 (Inadequate) - The draft EIS does not adequately assess the potentially significant environmental impacts of the proposal, or the reviewer has identified new, reasonably available, alternatives, that are outside of the spectrum of alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS, which should be analyzed in order to reduce the potentially significant environmental impacts. The identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussions are of such a magnitude that they should have full public review at a draft stage. This rating indicates EPA's belief that the draft EIS does not meet the purposes of NEPA and/or the Section 309 review, and thus should be formally revised and made available for public comment in a supplemental or revised draft EIS.

